WordPerfect Document Compare Summary

Original document: E:\RFP\SectionM_021800.wpd
Revised document: E:\RFP\SectionM_030600.wpd
Deletions are shown with the following attributes and color:
~~Strikeout~~, Blue RGB(0,0,255).
Deleted text is shown as full text.
Insertions are shown with the following attributes and color:
Double Underline, Redline, Red RGB(255,0,0).

The document was marked with 45 Deletions, 46 Insertions, 0 Moves.

M. EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1. GENERAL EVALUATION INFORMATION

Careful, full, and impartial consideration will be given to offers received pursuant to this solicitation. Only Offerors who demonstrate acceptable submission to the Government of all items included in Section L of this solicitation (or amendments thereof) will be considered for award. This includes:

- Submitting a proposal that meets all minimum requirements.
- Submitting a proposal that complies with all requirements of law, regulation, and conditions set forth in the solicitation.
- Submitting a proposal that meets all technical requirements and specifications of the solicitation.

In evaluating all areas of an Offeror's proposal, the Government may consider risk. Risk may ~~lower~~affect the Summary Rating of the Technical and Past Performance proposals.

M.1.1. Minimum Requirements

Proposals that fail to meet any of the Requirements cited in Section C.~~5~~4.2 will be considered unacceptable.

M.1.2. Competitive Range

The Contracting Officer will make the determination as to which offers are in the "Competitive Range." The Competitive Range shall be comprised of all of the most ~~highly- rated~~highly-rated proposals unless the range is further reduced for purposes of efficiency pursuant to FAR 15.306(c)(2). All Offerors in the competitive range will be invited to participate in the live test demonstration (LTD). The initial number of offers considered as being within the competitive range may be reduced when, as a result of the written or oral discussions, ~~any such~~an offer has been determined to no longer have a reasonable chance of being selected for award.

M.1.3. Discussion/ Final Proposal Revision

All Offerors selected to participate in discussions will be advised of deficiencies and serious weaknesses in their offer~~, and will be offered~~ as well as negative comments concerning past performance. Offerors will be presented a reasonable opportunity to ~~correct or resolve the deficiencies and to submit such price or cost, technical, or other~~

~~revisions to their offer that may result from the discussions~~revise the price and technical parts of their proposal accordingly and to address unfavorable reports of past performance. A final common ~~cut- off~~cut-off date which allows a reasonable opportunity for submission of written responses to ~~cited deficiencies~~discussion issues shall be established, and those Offerors remaining in the competitive range will be notified to submit a final proposal revision.

M.1.4. Responsibility

An Offeror must be determined responsible according to the standards in FAR Subpart 9.1, RESPONSIBLE PROSPECTIVE CONTRACTORS

M.1.5. Evaluation of Options

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options for the base contract period (FY2000-2003) to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise option(s).~~Only the~~

The performance levels offered on the LSC and AC will be the only factors used to evaluate the solution proposed for the option ~~years will be evaluated~~period.

M. 2. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals to be acceptable and eligible for evaluation must be prepared in accordance with, and comply with, the instructions given in this solicitation document and must meet the specifications and requirements set forth in Section C. Proposals meeting the minimum requirements and complying with the provisions of the Standard Form of Contract will be evaluated in accordance with the procedures described herein and award made to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is determined to be the most advantageous to the Government.

All proposals will be evaluated based on the technical, past performance, and price factors described in this section. Proposals will be evaluated with a view toward the award of a contract presenting the most favorable offer to the Government, therefore, proposals must contain such information as may be required to conduct a detailed and thorough evaluation.

The Offeror's proposal must give clear, detailed information sufficient to enable evaluation based on the major factors listed below (as well as on subfactors listed below).

Major factors considered in the evaluation of offers are as follows:

- **Technical** - This factor will receive a rating along with a narrative description. **The Live Test Demonstration will affect the rating of this factor.**

- **Past Performance** - The Offeror's proposal will receive a rating based on documented information regarding such factors as quality, timeliness, customer satisfaction, personnel, cost control and business practices that the Offeror has demonstrated on projects of a similar nature in the past.

- **Price** - The price proposal will be evaluated for magnitude and realism. Price factors will also be used as a further indication of ~~Offeror's~~Offerors' understanding of the scope of the requirement. Life Cycle Costs will be evaluated.

M. 2.1. Basis for Award

The contract awarded as a result of this Request for Proposals (RFP) will be an integrated assessment by the Contracting Officer of the results of the evaluation based on the evaluation factors and their relative order of importance as indicated below.

Ultimately, the source selection decision will take into account the Contractor's capability to meet the requirements of this solicitation on a timely and ~~cost-effective~~cost-effective basis. The Government reserves such right of flexibility in making the source selection to assure placement of a contract in the Government's best interest in accordance with the evaluation criteria.

Accordingly, the Government may award any resulting contract to other than the lowest priced Offeror, or other than the Offeror with the highest technical merit rating.

M. 2.2. Degree of Relative Importance Assigned to Major Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

The Technical factor will be weighted significantly more than Past Performance. The combination of the Technical factor and Past Performance will be paramount with respect to Price.

Only the ~~$69 million~~ configuration proposed for the $69 million funding level stated in the Project Agreement will be evaluated for technical merit, ~~risk~~past performance, and cost/ price. ~~It~~As discussed in section C.2, it is expected that~~, if~~ any additional funds ~~become available for the HPCS, the offered performance will increase~~will be used to increase the HPCS computational throughput and other resources needed to provide a

balanced system approximately in proportion to the increase in ~~funds~~funding.

M. 3. TECHNICAL

The following categories will be used to evaluate the technical proposals. They are of roughly equal importance.

- LSC
- ~~AS~~AC
- HSMS
- System-wide components

M.3.1 LSC

Factors used to evaluate the LSC are, in order of decreasing importance,

- Performance
- Reliability, Availability, and Support
- Ease of Use
- Capacity

The subfactors used to evaluate the Performance may include, but are not limited to, the System Life Throughput offered on the initial system, the throughput in suites per hour offered on the initial system, the score given to the benchmark scaling study, and the performance increment offered on upgrades during the base contract period.

The subfactors used to evaluate the Reliability, Availability, and Support may include, but are not limited to, the availability level offered in the initial system, the capability of the failover hardware and software, the available features in the resource management, batch queuing and scheduling, load balancing, and checkpointing software, and the capability to operate and be repaired in degraded mode.

The subfactors used to evaluate the Ease of Use may include, but are not limited to, the completeness and usability of the offered OS and programming environment, the available features in the resource management, accounting, batch queuing and scheduling, and checkpointing software, and the consistency of software common to the LSC and AC.

The subfactors used to evaluate the Capacity may include, but are not limited to, the memory per processor, the disk space per node, the total memory and disk, and the capacity of the interactive resources.

M.3.2. AC

Factors used to evaluate the AC are, in order of decreasing importance:

- Reliability, Availability, and Support
- Performance
- Ease of Use
- Capacity

The subfactors used to evaluate Reliability, Availability, and Support may include, but are not limited to, the availability level offered on the initial system, the capability of the failover hardware and software, the available features in the resource management and checkpointing software~~, failover capability~~, and capabilities for operation and repair in degraded mode.

The subfactors used to evaluate Performance may include, but are not limited to, the System Life Throughput in total number of suites offered on the initial system, the throughput of the AS in suites per hour offered on the initial system, the performance of individual codes on the AC, and the performance of interactive commands issued during the pre-award LTD.

The subfactors used to evaluate the Ease of Use may include, but are not limited to, the completeness and usability of the offered OS and programming environment, the available features in the resource management, accounting, batch queuing and scheduling, and checkpointing software, the features available in the user and operator interface, and the consistency of software common to the LSC and AC.

Subfactors used to evaluate Capacity may include, but are not limited to, the memory per processor and maximum memory per processor, the shared memory per node, the size of the shared address space, the disk per node, and the total disk.

M.3.3 HSMS

Factors used to evaluate the HSMS are, in order of decreasing importance:

- Reliability, Availability, and Support

- Performance
- Capacity
- Ease of Use

The subfactors used to evaluate Reliability, Availability, and Support may include, but are not limited to, the capability of the failover software, capabilities for operation and repair in degraded mode, the reliability of the nearline and offline media, and the offered data recovery service.

Subfactors used to evaluate Performance include, but are not limited to, the archive benchmark performance, ~~the data~~aggregate sustained transfer rate of individual devices, aggregate tape positioning rate for nearline tapes, the robotic tape library performance, ~~and~~ the performance of the user and operator interfaces to the data migration software, abd the performance of file transfers to the LSC and AC.

Subfactors used to evaluate Capacity of the HSMS include, but are not limited to, the capacity of the online, nearline, and offline tiers in the data archive, the ~~schedule~~number of ~~capacity increments offered on upgrades to the HSMS~~individual devices, and total bandwidth between nearline and online tiers in the HSMS.

Subfactors used to evaluate Ease of Use include, but are not limited to, the functionality and usability of the user and operator interfaces to the data migration software, including the ability to send files from tape directly to different destinations over the network and for users to group related files and directories on a single tape volume, and the plan for accessing the legacy archive.

M.3.4 System-wide components

Factors used to evaluate the system-wide components are, in order of decreasing importance:

- ~~Balance~~Balanced performance and capacity between the HPCS subsystems
- ~~/home file server~~HFS implementation
- Vendor Services
- Facilities

~~Balance~~As discussed in section C.2, balance implies that the capacity and performance

of the ~~HPCS subsystems such as disk on the LSC, AS, and online tier of the HSMS, and nearline and offline capacities in the HSMS, impose no~~LSC, AC, HSMS, HFS, and their interconnection allows efficient use of HPCS resources, in part by minimizing bottlenecks to the flow of information (as represented by the benchmarks) between the components of the HPCS~~. Further, the capacity and performance of these HPCS subsystems must increase approximately in proportion to increases in the throughput performance of the LSC and AS~~ throughout its life. The subfactors used to evaluate balance may include, but are not limited to, the individual capacities of the HPCS components, the bandwidth between HPCS components, and the cluster software used to manage the various resources of the HPCS.

~~The LSC, AS, HSMS, and /home file server need not be upgraded simultaneously, but balanced performance at all times is desired and will be evaluated.~~

The subfactors used to evaluate the ~~/home file server~~HFS may include, but are not limited to, the HFS benchmark performance, the proposed availability level of the ~~/home file server~~HFS, and the /home directory migration plan.

The subfactors used to evaluate Vendor Services may include, but are not limited to, the quality of the offeror's ~~service plan~~Service Plan, Failure Response Plan, and Failure Escalation ~~procedure~~Procedure.

Subfactors used to evaluate the required Facilities include, but are not limited to, the amount of electrical power, cooling capacity, and floor space required to operate the ~~HPCS~~initial delivery of the HPCS and all offered upgrades, and the impact that facilities modifications required for the initial installation and all upgrades may have on the on the performance or availability of the Government's existing equipment.

M.4. PAST PERFORMANCE

This factor will be rated based on the information and opinions gained by contacting the references listed in the proposal, firms with which the offeror has a history of past performance, and possibly other customers known to the Government or who may have useful and relevant information. The Government reserves the right not to contact all references provided and to contact other references even though not provided by the Offeror.

The following subfactors will be considered (all subfactors are of equal importance):

- Quality of products or service, compliance with contract requirements, accuracy of reports and technical excellence.

- Timeliness of performance and reliability.
- Cost control, remaining within budget, current accurate and complete billing, relationship of negotiated costs to actuals and being cost efficient.
- Satisfaction of customer end users with the contractor's service.
- Business relations, management, an effective subcontracting program, reasonable and effective contractor recommended solutions.

Assessment of the Offeror's past performance will be one means of evaluating the credibility of the Offeror's proposal, and relative capability to meet performance requirements.

Information ~~utilized in the evaluation of past performance will be obtained from the references listed in the proposal, other customers known to the Government, and any others who may have useful and relative information. Information~~ will also be considered regarding any significant subcontractors.

Evaluation of past performance will include a determination of the Offeror's commitment to customer satisfaction and will include conclusions of informed judgment. The basis for the past performance rating will be documented. ~~The Government reserves the right not to contact all references provided and to contact other references even though not provided by the Offeror.~~

During discussions~~,~~ Offerors will be given an opportunity to address unfavorable reports of past performance, if the Offeror has not had a previous opportunity to review the rating. Recent contracts will be examined to ensure that corrective measures have been implemented. Prompt corrective action in isolated instances may not outweigh overall negative trends.

If an Offeror does not have a past performance history relating to this solicitation, the Offeror will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on this factor.

M.5. Price

The price proposal will be evaluated for magnitude and realism, but will not be numerically scored. To be considered acceptable under this solicitation, the Offeror must propose fixed prices for the items being acquired.

M.6. EVALUATION FACTORS

All Technical and Past Performance portions of proposals will be evaluated using the

criteria listed in Table 1 below. Each Offeror will be assigned a Summary Rating for its Technical and Past Performance, determined through evaluation of its proposal.

Table 1. Evaluation Criteria

ADJECTIVE RATING	DESCRIPTION
Unacceptable	PROPOSED APPROACH HAS MANY DEFICIENCIES OR PROPOSED APPROACH IS TOTALLY WITHOUT MERIT. PAST PERFORMANCE UNACCEPTABLE.
Inadequate	PROPOSED APPROACH HAS ONE OR MORE DEFICIENCIES OR MAJOR WEAKNESSES, AND IS NOT CAPABLE OF IMPROVEMENT TO ACCEPTABLE OR BETTER WITHOUT ADOPTION OF A NEW APPROACH. PAST PERFORMANCE MORE NEGATIVE THAN POSITIVE.
Marginal	PROPOSED APPROACH HAS DEFICIENCIES OR SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESSES, BUT IS CAPABLE OF IMPROVEMENT TO ACCEPTABLE OR BETTER WITHOUT ADOPTION OF A NEW APPROACH. NO OR NEUTRAL PAST PERFORMANCE.
Acceptable	PROPOSED APPROACH FULLY MEETS THE REQUIREMENT WITH NO DEFICIENCY OR SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESS. PAST PERFORMANCE MORE POSITIVE THAN NEGATIVE.
Good	PROPOSED APPROACH FULLY MEETS REQUIREMENT AND HAS SEVERAL SUPERIOR FEATURES WITH NO DEFICIENCY OR SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESS. PAST PERFORMANCE ACCEPTABLE IN ALL AREAS/SUPERIOR IN SEVERAL AREAS.
Outstanding	PROPOSED APPROACH FULLY MEETS REQUIREMENT AND IS SUPERIOR IN MOST FEATURES WITH NO DEFICIENCY OR WEAKNESS. PAST PERFORMANCE ACCEPTABLE IN ALL AREAS/SUPERIOR IN MOST AREAS.